

## REMARKS

Claims 12-13 and 22-23 have been canceled and claims 11, 21 and 28 have been amended. Claims 11, 14-21, and 24-30 remain for further consideration. No new matter has been added.

The objections and rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

**1-3.** Claims 11, 14-21 and 24-30 remain following entry of this amendment.

**4-5.** The Examiner's comments in the Official Action with respect to the amendments and arguments put forth by the Applicant in the most recent Amendment, filed July 28, 2005, are hereby noted and appreciated. In response and as described in detail hereinbelow, the Applicant has canceled claims 12-13 and 22-23 and has amended claims 11, 21 and 28 herein. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's comments are hereby rendered moot.

**6-13.** Claims 11-14, 18 and 20 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,771,663 to Jha (hereinafter "Jha").

### **Claim 11**

Claim 11 has been amended to include the feature "*a telegram identification portion of the header section that specifies an identification of data associated with the host network standard when the data in the first region of the data section is formatted in accordance with the host network standard contains an identification of data associated with the extraneous standard in place of the identification of data associated with the host network standard.*" Claim 11 has

also been amended to include the feature *“a telegram length portion of the header section that specifies a length of the data associated with the host network standard when the data in the first region of the data section is formatted in accordance with the host network standard no longer specifies the length of the data associated with the host network standard when the data in the first region of the data section is formatted in accordance with the extraneous standard.”*

Support for these features is in the specification and drawings as filed – specifically in each of FIGs. 2-5 and the corresponding text of the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in Jha, or in any of the other cited references of record in this application, is there disclosure, explicit or implicit, of these features. More specifically, there is no teaching anywhere in Jha, including those portions cited in the Official Action, of portions of the header section used in accordance with the host network standard that are now used in accordance with an extraneous standard. Indeed, it is these specific data information formatting features that allow a host network having a data transmission standard to utilize a standard for the transmission of data that is different from the host network standard. That is, the host network is no longer constrained to utilize only data formatted in accordance with the host network standard. Thus, it is respectfully requested that claim 11, as amended herein, is presently in condition for allowance and should be passed to issuance.

#### **Claim 12-13**

Claims 12-13 have been canceled.

**Claims 14, 18 and 20**

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims is moot, since each of these claims depends directly from claim 11, which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

**14-19.** Claims 15 and 16 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in Jha and the MOST Specification Framework Rev. 1.1 (hereinafter “the MOST Spec”).

In response, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims is moot, since each of these claims depends directly from claim 11, which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

**20-24.** Claims 17 and 19 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in Jha and U.S. Pat. No. 6,172,980 to Flanders *et al.* (hereinafter “Flanders”).

In response, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims is moot, since each of these claims depends directly from claim 11, which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

**25-36.** Claims 21-26 and 28-30 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in the MOST Spec and Jha.

## Claim 21

Claim 21 has been amended to include the feature *“a telegram identification portion of the header section that specifies an identification of data associated with the MOST standard when the data in the first region of the data section is formatted in accordance with the MOST standard contains an identification of data associated with the extraneous standard in place of the identification of data associated with the MOST standard.”* Claim 21 has also been amended to include the feature *“a telegram length portion of the header section that specifies a length of the data associated with the MOST standard when the data in the first region of the data section is formatted in accordance with the MOST standard no longer specifies the length of the data associated with the MOST standard when the data in the first region of the data section is formatted in accordance with the extraneous standard.”*

Support for these features is in the specification and drawings as filed – specifically in each of FIGs. 2-5 and the corresponding text of the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in the MOST Spec and Jha, or in any of the other cited references of record in this application, is there disclosure, explicit or implicit, of these features. More specifically, there is no teaching anywhere in Jha, including those portions cited in the Official Action, of portions of the header section that are used in accordance with the MOST standard to be now used in accordance with an extraneous standard. Indeed, it is these specific data information formatting features that allow a MOST network having a standard for the transmission of data to utilize a standard for the transmission of data that is different from the MOST standard. That is, the MOST network is no longer constrained to utilize only data formatted in accordance with the MOST standard. Thus, it is respectfully requested that claim 21, as amended herein, is presently in condition for allowance and should be passed to issuance.

**Claims 22-23**

Claims 22-23 have been canceled.

**Claims 24-26**

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims is moot, since each of these claims depends directly from claim 21, which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

**Claim 28**

Claim 28 has been amended to include the feature “*a telegram identification portion of the header section that specifies an identification of data associated with the MOST standard when the data in the first region of the data section is formatted in accordance with the MOST standard contains an identification of data associated with the extraneous standard in place of the identification of data associated with the MOST standard.*” Claim 28 has also been amended to include the feature “*a telegram length portion of the header section that specifies a length of the data associated with the MOST standard when the data in the first region of the data section is formatted in accordance with the MOST standard no longer specifies the length of the data associated with the MOST standard when the data in the first region of the data section is formatted in accordance with the extraneous standard.*”

Support for these features is in the specification and drawings as filed – specifically in each of FIGs. 2-5 and the corresponding text of the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in the MOST Spec and Jha, or in any of the other cited references of record in this application, is there disclosure, explicit or implicit, of these features. More specifically, there is no teaching anywhere in Jha, including those portions cited in the Official Action, of portions of the header section that are used in accordance with the MOST standard to be now used in accordance with an extraneous standard. Indeed, it is these specific data information formatting features that allow a MOST network having a standard for the transmission of data therewithin to utilize a standard for the transmission of data that is different from the MOST standard. That is, the MOST network is no longer constrained to utilize only data formatted in accordance with the MOST standard. Thus, it is respectfully requested that claim 28, as amended herein, is presently in condition for allowance and should be passed to issuance.

#### **Claims 29-30**

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims is moot, since each of these claims depends directly from claim 28, which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

**37-39.** Claim 27 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in the Most Spec, Jha and Flanders.

In response, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of this claim is moot, since this claim depends directly from claim 21, which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 11, 14-21 and 24-30 are respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Patrick J. O'Shea". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Patrick J. O'Shea  
Reg. No. 35,305  
O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C.  
1500 Main Street, Suite 912  
Springfield, MA 01115  
(413) 731-3100, Ext. 102